

Application No.:	09/727,991
Amendment Dated:	February 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of:	November 29, 2006

REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 12 and 17 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757 to Multer, et al. ("Multer"). The Examiner asserts that Multer discloses all of the limitations of claims 1-27.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12 and 17 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of "comparing said respective versions of said first application on said first electronic device and said first application on said third electronic device, said comparing step performed with only the version information of the version of said first application located on said third electronic device." Claim 12 has been amended to recite the step of "comparing said respective versions of web clipping applications located on said first and said third electronic device, said comparing step performed with only the version information of the version of said web clipping application located on said third electronic device." Claim 17 has been amended to recite the step of "comparing said respective versions of said first application on said first electronic device and said first application on said third electronic device, said comparing step performed with only the version information of the version of said first application located on said third electronic device."

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 17, is directed to a method of updating a plurality of applications on a first electronic device over a communication network which includes a second and third electronic device. In particular, the amended claims recite a conduit which is hosted by the second electronic device and assigned to one of the applications jointly on the first and second electronic device. The conduit acts as a gateway between the second electronic device (commonly referred to as a host device) and a third electronic device (server) and also as a gateway between the second electronic device (host) and

the first electronic device (PDA) (see Specification, pages 26-27). The conduit facilitates synchronization of the application even when the PDA is not connected to the network (via a conduit to the communication network) so that, for instance, determining if there is a newer version of the application, occurs via the conduit. The conduit compares the respective versions of the application where the comparing step is performed with only the version information of the application located on the server. That is, there is no need to download the whole application or calculate changes in the application versions.

By contrast, Multer is directed to a synchronization between the first and third electronic devices. The synchronization occurs between the first and third devices so that a difference engine transfers difference information between the first and third devices. Importantly, only the difference information (Δ in the Multer reference) is transferred from the first and third device with the differencing receiver in the first device reconstructing the file from the difference information (see Multer, column 6, lines 3-19). Importantly, Multer does not disclose or suggest the comparing of the respective versions of the application where the comparing step is performed with only the version information of the application located on the server.

As mentioned, Multer teaches a differencing transmitter and receiver (or differencing synchronizer). The differencing synchronizer is not hosted on the second electronic device (host in the nomenclature of the present invention). The desktop computer has a device engine (Fig. 9, and columns 11-14) but merely acts as an interface for difference information generated by the Palm device (first electronic device of the present invention). Applicant submits that the device engine does not provide the structures and functions of the conduit as provided for by the present invention.

Since the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation recited in the amended independent claims, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 12 and 17 are allowable over the cited reference. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-11, 13-16 and 18-27, by their dependency on independent claims 1, 12 and 17 respectively, are similarly allowable.

Application No.: 09/727,991
Amendment Dated: February 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: November 29, 2006

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: February 28, 2007

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860